



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,255	09/23/2006	Pieter Van Lieshout	US040018US2	1876
24737 7590 06/09/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
BOYD, JONATHAN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/599,255

Applicant(s)

LIESHOUT ET AL.

Examiner

JONATHAN BOYD

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 September 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/23/2006
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application number 10/599255 filed September 23rd 2006. Claims 1-27 are currently pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Acknowledgment is made of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Form PTO-1449 filed on September 23rd 2006. The IDS has been considered.

Claim Objections

3. The claims are objected to because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being of undue breadth.

A "single means" claim, i.e. where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element or means, is subject to an undue breadth

rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See *In re Hyatt*, 218 USPQ 195, (CAFC 1983) and MPEP 2164.08(a). This simply means that the claim is related to a method with a single step. This is improper because the method inherently should have more than one step to be considered "a method".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-8, 12-19, 23 and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fishkin et al (6,160,540) (herein "Fishkin").

In regards to claim 1, Fishkin teaches a method for controlling a visual display on a display panel by applying a bending force to the display panel (*See; Column 9, lines 50-61 and Fig. 5*).

In regards to claims 2, 13 and 24, Fishkin teaches a method comprising detecting the bending force and modifying the visual display in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the bending force and the visual display (*See; Column 9, lines 50-61 where the display is password protected in response to a display being deformed*).

In regards to claims 3 and 14, Fishkin teaches wherein the display panel includes

a control device for modifying the predetermined relationship between the bending force and the visual display, and the method further comprises modifying the predetermined relationship between the bending force and the visual display (See; *Column 9, lines 50-61 where a control device is inherently taught to modify the display in response to the display bending*).

In regards to claim 4 and 15, Fishkin teaches wherein the display panel includes a control device for receiving an input for modifying the visual display according to a predetermined relationship between the input applied to the control device and the visual display, and the method further comprises modifying the predetermined relationship between the input applied to the control device and the visual display in accordance with the bending force applied to the display panel (See; *Column 9, lines 50-61 where a control device is inherently taught to modify the display in response to the display bending with the predetermined relationship of password protecting the document in response to a fold*).

In regards to claim 5 and 16, Fishkin teaches generating a torque on the display panel through application of the bending force; detecting the torque; and modifying the visual display in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected torque and the visual display (See; *Figures 3-10 which measure either the rotational or planar components of the bending display to find torque*).

In regards to claim 6 and 17, Fishkin teaches wherein the torque includes a twisting torque component and the method further comprises detecting the twisting torque component and modifying the visual display in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected twisting torque component and the visual display (*See; Column 10, lines 38-49 and Fig. 10*).

In regards to claim 7 and 18, Fishkin teaches wherein the torque includes a bending torque component and the method further comprises detecting the bending torque component and modifying the visual display in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected bending torque component and the visual display (*See; Column 9, lines 50-61 and Fig. 5 and 6*).

In regards to claim 8 and 19, Fishkin teaches wherein the torque includes a planar torque component and the method further comprises detecting the planar torque component and modifying the visual display in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected planar torque component and the visual display (*See; Column 9, lines 27-49 and Figure 4 where a user applies a planar force to move an object and where a user minimizes an object by squeezing the display and also Figure 7 where a user scales an image by stretching the display*).

In regards to claim 12, Fishkin teaches an apparatus for controlling a visual display on a display panel by applying a bending force to the display panel (*See;*

Column 9, lines 50-61 and Fig. 5), the apparatus comprising: the display panel; and a detector operatively attached to the display panel for detecting the bending force applied to the display panel (*The detectors are inherent since there has to be something detecting the deformations in the display*).

In regards to claim 23, Fishkin teaches a portable electronic device comprising: a display panel; a processor for generating a visual display on a display panel (*See; Column 5, lines 47-48 for a processor*); and an apparatus for controlling the visual display on the display panel by applying a bending force to the display panel; the apparatus for controlling the visual display comprising the display panel and a detector (*The detectors are inherent since there has to be something detecting the deformations in the display*) operatively attached to the display panel for detecting the bending force applied to the display panel (*See; Column 9, lines 50-61 and Fig. 5*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 9-11 and 20-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishkin et al (6,160,540) (herein "Fishkin") in view of Fujieda et al (2002/0070910) (herein "Fujieda").

In regards to claim 9 and 20, Fujieda teaches wherein the display panel includes a housing and a stowable display screen which may be rolled up into and stowed within a housing, with the housing extending along and attached to an edge of the stowable display screen, and the method further comprises applying the bending force to the stowable display screen (*See; Figures 1-3 for a flexible display that rolls into a housing*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Fishkin's housing with a stowable housing with roller as taught by Fujieda to decrease the surface area of the device when not in use.

In regards to claim 10 and 21, Fujieda teaches wherein the display panel includes a roller attached to the stowable display screen for receiving the stowable display screen as it is rolled up into the housing (*See; Fig. 3, element 150*), and the method further comprises: detecting a reaction on the roller resulting from application of the bending force to the display panel; and modifying the visual display in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected reaction on the roller and the visual display (*It is obvious to place force sensors on the roller since it is the only portion*

rigid enough to place sensors. Also see p[0016] where the image is only displayed on the area extended outside of the housing).

In regards to claim 11 and 22, Fujieda teaches wherein the reaction on the roller, resulting from application of the bending force to the display panel, is a torque on the roller (*This is an obvious design choice, to sense the torque at the roller, since it is the only place rigid enough to place sensors*).

10. Claims 25-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishkin et al (6,160,540) (herein "Fishkin") in view of Sawyer (2004/0052037).

In regards to claim 25, Sawyer teaches wherein: the visual display includes a movable cursor; and the controller modifies the visual display by moving the cursor in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected bending force and the visual display (*See; p[0038] where a cursor is moved on a flexible display*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify Fishkin's flexible display with a known graphical user interface as taught by Sawyer to allow the user to navigate the display.

In regards to claim 26, Sawyer inherently teaches wherein: the visual display is scrollable; and the controller modifies the visual display by scrolling the visual display in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected bending force and the visual display (*See; p[0038] where a cursor control device is claimed. Inherently*

cursor control devices can scroll through a display).

In regards to claim 27, Sawyer inherently teaches wherein: the visual display includes a page up /down mode; and the controller modifies the visual display by paging up/down in accordance with a predetermined relationship between the detected bending force and the visual display (See; p[0038] for a keyboard. Inherently keyboards include page up / page down keys).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lichtfuss (2002/0180709) for a flexible display.

Aoki et al (2005/0110702) for a foldable display.

Dowling et al (2003/0050019) for a retractable display.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JONATHAN BOYD whose telephone number is (571)270-7503. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thur 6:00 - 4:00 est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on 571-272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Amr Awad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
AU 2629